



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,912	02/06/2004	Constantine A. Domashnev	4461-040040	7385

28289 7590 07/06/2007  
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.  
700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER
----------

SEREBOFF, NEAL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/773,912	DOMASHNEV, CONSTANTINE A.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Neal R. Sereboff	3626	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s), \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. In the amendment filed 5/16/2007, the following has occurred. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1 through 22 are pending.

### *Notice to Applicant*

2. It is the Examiner's position that absent evidence of new or unexpected results, it is not inventive in terms of patentability to take one or more databases ( $D_1, D_2, D_3, \dots D_N$ ) which store one or more pieces of information ( $I_1, I_2, I_3, \dots I_N$ ) and add (or subtract) an additional number of databases ( $X$ ) to store all or part of the same information by allocating the data between the various databases (that is,  $D_1$  and  $D_{N+1}$  store  $I_1$ ;  $D_2$  and  $D_{N+2}$  store  $I_2$ ;  $D_3$  and  $D_{N+3}$  store  $I_3$ ; ... while  $D_N$  and  $D_{N+X}$  store  $I_N$ ).

A modification increasing the number of databases (for example, having two databases store information previously stored by just one database) is analogous to making functions, structures, or actions separable. It is the Examiner's position that when the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is that the prior art does not disclose an element as separable, as a matter of law, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the element separable. See MPEP §2144.04 V. C. and *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961). It is desirable to allocate the database information to various databases to enhance data management by organizing content, freeing up hard drive space, and speeding up processing speeds because less data has to be searched.

Examiner posits that Applicants have not asserted any new or unexpected results regarding their hardware configuration (and the software running their hardware configuration)

Art Unit: 3626

of their server system. Absent such new or unexpected results, such modifications either increasing or decreasing the number of databases would have helped maintain benefits from economies of scale in addition to offering excellent data management, fast response, and room for expansion.

Therefore if the claimed database was not directly disclosed, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the additional claimed database. Such a modification would have helped maintain benefits from economies of scale in addition to offering excellent data management, fast response, and room for expansion.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 12, 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz et al, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/ 0052760 in view of Henley, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/ 0195838.

5. As per claim 1, Munoz teaches an electronic prescription handling system comprising:

- A first computer configured to transmit a prescription by a physician (see figure 14 for network design and paragraph 58 for the prescribing physician);
- A server communicatively connected to the first computer (see figure 14), wherein the server is configured to receive the prescription from the first computer and the server is

Art Unit: 3626

remote from the first computer (see figure 14 where the server is connected through the Internet as discussed in paragraph 58);

- A first pharmacy having a first pharmacy computer communicatively connected to the server, wherein:
  - The first pharmacy computer is configured to retrieve the prescription from the server (see figure 14 where the third party may be any number of third parties as described in paragraph 72); and
  - The first pharmacy computer is configured to transmit a first bid for the prescription to the server (see paragraph 67), wherein the first bid is stored on the server (see 67 where the bid results are compiled or stored);
- A second pharmacy having a second pharmacy computer communicatively connected to the server, wherein:
  - The second pharmacy computer is configured to retrieve the prescription from the server (see figure 14 where the third party may be any number of third parties as described in paragraph 72); and
  - The second pharmacy computer is configured to transmit a second bid for the prescription to the server (see paragraph 67), wherein the second bid is stored on the server (see 67 where the bid results are compiled or stored); and
- A second computer communicatively connected to the server, wherein:
  - The second computer is configured to retrieve the first bid and the second bid (see figure 14 where the physician's office can contain multiple computers connected through a network as described in paragraph 59).

Art Unit: 3626

Munoz does not explicitly teach the system wherein

- The second computer is configured to select one of (i) the first bid, and (ii) the second bid;
- When the first bid is selected, the first pharmacy fills the prescription; and
- When the second bid is selected, the second pharmacy fills the prescription.

However, Henley teaches the system wherein

- A second computer communicatively connected to the server, wherein:
  - The second computer is configured to select one of (i) the first bid, and (ii) the second bid (see paragraph 101 where the bids are for the medical service that according to paragraph 93 could also be for prescriptions);
- When the first bid is selected, the first pharmacy fills the prescription (see paragraph 102 where the parties of the transaction are the winning bidders); and
- When the second bid is selected, the second pharmacy fills the prescription (see paragraph 102 where the parties of the transaction are the winning bidders).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz with the motivation to enable prospective clients/ patients and professional service providers to competitively negotiate fees for proffered services through an interactive on-line professional services auction transaction system implemented over a publicly accessible communications network such as the Internet (see Henley abstract).

6. As per claim 12, Munoz in view of Henley teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Munoz further teaches the system wherein the first pharmacy is one of a brick-and-

Art Unit: 3626

mortar pharmacy and an online pharmacy (see paragraph 67 where the local pharmacies are brick-and-mortar and a US pharmacy may be either brick-and-mortar and online or both brick-and-mortar and online and further where the pharmacy type is non-functional).

7. As per claim 13, Munoz teaches a method for issuing a prescription comprising the steps of:

- Transmitting a prescription from a first computer by a physician (see figure 14 for network design and paragraph 58 for the prescribing physician);
- Receiving the prescription on a server, wherein the server is remote from the first computer (see figure 14 where the server is connected through the Internet as discussed in paragraph 58);
- Retrieving the prescription from the server (see figure 14 where the third party may be any number of third parties as described in paragraph 72);
- Submitting a first bid for the prescription to the server from a first pharmacy having a first pharmacy computer (see 67 where the bid results are compiled or stored);
- Submitting a second bid for the prescription to the server from a second pharmacy having a second pharmacy computer (see 67 where the bid results are compiled or stored);
- Storing the first bid and the second bid on the server (see paragraph 100 where the global database is on the server);
- Transmitting the first bid and the second bid to a second computer (see 67 where the bid results are compiled or stored);
- Viewing the first bid and the second bid on the second computer (see paragraph 67).

Munoz does not explicitly teach the method comprising

Art Unit: 3626

- Making a selection consisting of one of (i) the first bid, and (ii) the second bid;
- Transmitting the selection to the server; and
- Informing one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy to fill the prescription.

Munoz does not explicitly teach the method comprising

- Making a selection consisting of one of (i) the first bid, and (ii) the second bid (see paragraph 101 where the bids are for the medical service that according to paragraph 93 could also be for prescriptions);
- Transmitting the selection to the server (see paragraph 102 where the server makes the selection and the pharmacies notice the selection); and
- Informing one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy to fill the prescription (see paragraph 102 where the parties of the transaction are the winning bidders).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz with the motivation to enable prospective clients/ patients and professional service providers to competitively negotiate fees for proffered services through an interactive on-line professional services auction transaction system implemented over a publicly accessible communications network such as the Internet (see Henley abstract).

8. As per claim 16, Munoz in view of Henley teaches the method of claim 13 as described above. Munoz in view of Henley further teaches the method comprising the steps of transmitting to the second computer at least one of:



Art Unit: 3626

- Contact information of one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy (see paragraph 67);
- A set of directions from one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy to an address specified by the second computer; and
- A map-illustrating an address on the map of one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy.

9. **Claims 2 – 9 and 14 – 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz et al, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/ 0052760 in view of Henley, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/ 0195838 as applied to claims 1 and 13 as above and further in view of Hwangbo, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2003/ 0154376.

10. As per claim 2, Munoz in view of Henley teaches the system of claim 1 as described above.

Munoz in view of Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system further comprising a portable storage medium configured to be interfaced with the first computer, wherein the portable storage medium includes an application for transmitting a digital certificate to the server when the portable storage medium interfaces with the first computer.

However, Hwangbo teaches the electronic prescription handling system further comprising

- A portable storage medium configured to be interfaced with the first computer (see paragraph 1),
  - Wherein the portable storage medium includes an application (see paragraph 1)
    - For transmitting a digital certificate (see paragraph 1)

Art Unit: 3626

- To the server (see figure 13)
- When the portable storage medium interfaces with the first computer (see paragraph 67 where the certificates automatically access the server).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

11. As per claim 3, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 2 as described above.

Munoz in view of Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the portable storage medium is one of (i) a CD-ROM, (ii) a DVD-ROM, and (iii) flash memory.

However, Hwangbo teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the portable storage medium is one of (i) a CD-ROM, (ii) a DVD-ROM, and (iii) flash memory (see paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

12. As per claim 4, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 2 as described above.

Art Unit: 3626

Munoz in view of Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is configured to authenticate the digital certificate.

However, Hwangbo teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is configured to authenticate the digital certificate (see figure 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

13. As per claim 5, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 4 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is configured to transmit a prescription entry web page to the first computer upon the server authenticating (see paragraph 63 where the physician logs in).

Munoz does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is configured to transmit a prescription entry web page to the first computer upon the server authenticating the digital certificate.

However, Hwangbo teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is configured to transmit a prescription entry web page to the first computer upon the server authenticating the digital certificate (see paragraph 87 where the mail is a web entry page as described in paragraph 33 where the medium is pre-inserted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

14. As per claim 6, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 5 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the system wherein

- A pharmaceutical database for storing a plurality of drug formularies therein (see paragraph 64).

Munoz does not explicitly teach the system wherein

- A physician database utilized to authenticate the digital certificate.

However, Hwanbo teaches the system wherein

- A physician database utilized to authenticate the digital certificate (see paragraph 115 where the user is a physician).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

15. As per claim 7, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 6 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the system wherein the server comprises:

- A prescription database for storing the prescription received from the first computer (see figure 14 where database 304 or database 334 stores the information);

Art Unit: 3626

- A patient database for storing patient information (see figure 14 where database 304 or database 334 stores the information);
- A pharmacy database for storing pharmacy data (see figure 14 where database 304 or database 334 stores the information); and
- A bid database for storing the first bid and the second bid (see figure 14 where database 304 or database 334 stores the information).

16. As per claim 8, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 7 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the system wherein the patient information comprises at least one of (i) an insurance provider identifier for a patient, (ii) a medical history for the patient, (iii) a drug interaction list for the patient, and (iv) an allergic reaction list for the patient (see figure 13 where the insurance company and patient history is entered).

17. As per claim 9, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 7 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the system wherein the pharmacy data comprises contact information for one of (i) the first pharmacy and, (ii) the second pharmacy (see paragraph 67).

18. As per claim 14, Munoz in view of Henley teaches the method of claim 13 as described above.

Munoz in view of Henley does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- Interfacing a portable storage medium with the first computer, wherein the portable storage medium includes an application for transmitting a digital certificate; and
- Transmitting the digital certificate to the server.

Art Unit: 3626

Chan teaches the steps of:

- Interfacing a portable storage medium with the first computer (see paragraph 1), wherein the portable storage medium includes an application (see paragraph 1) for transmitting a digital certificate (see paragraph 1); and
- Transmitting the digital certificate to the server (see figure 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

19. As per claim 15, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the method of claim 14 as described above.

Munoz further teaches the step of transmitting a prescription entry web page to the first computer (see paragraph 63 where the physician logs in).

Munoz does not explicitly teach the step of authenticating the digital certificate on the server.

However, Hwangbo teaches the step of authenticating the digital certificate on the server (see paragraph 87 where the mail is a web entry page as described in paragraph 33 where the medium is pre-inserted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Munoz in view of Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated these features into Munoz in view of Henley with the motivation to provide certification and security in electronic commerce (see Hwangbo paragraph 1).

20. **Claims 10 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz et al, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/ 0052760 in view of Henley, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/ 0195838 as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Hwangbo, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2003/ 0154376 as applied to claims 2 through 9 above, and further in view of McCormick, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/0035484.

21. As per claim 10, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 9 as described above.

Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo do not explicitly teach the system wherein the server is further configured to transmit at least one of (i) an address of the first pharmacy or second pharmacy, and (ii) a set of directions from the first pharmacy or second pharmacy to an address specified by the second computer.

However, McCormick teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is further configured to transmit at least one of (i) an address of the first pharmacy or second pharmacy, and (ii) a set of directions from the first pharmacy or second pharmacy to an address specified by the second computer (see paragraph 89).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated this feature Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo with the motivation to eliminate inefficiencies at the doctor's office in generating the prescription (see McCormick paragraph 5).

22. As per claim 11, Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo teaches the system of claim 10 as described above.

Art Unit: 3626

Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is further configured to transmit a map illustrating the address on the map of one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy.

However, McCormick teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server is further configured to transmit a map illustrating the address on the map of one of (i) the first pharmacy, and (ii) the second pharmacy (see paragraph 90).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo. One of ordinary skill in the art would have incorporated this feature Munoz in view of Henley, further in view of Hwangbo with the motivation to eliminate inefficiencies at the doctor's office in generating the prescription (see McCormick paragraph 5).

23. **Claims 17 – 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henley, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/0065758 (see reference A on the attached PTO-892) in view of Chan et al., U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2001/0039503 (see reference B on the attached PTO-892) and Felsher, U.S. Pre-Grant Publication Number 2002/0010679 (see reference D on the attached PTO-892).

24. As per claim 17, Henley teaches an electronic prescription handling system comprising:

- A computer (see paragraph 32);
- A server communicatively connected to the computer (see paragraph 32);
- Further wherein a user of the computer enters a prescription (see paragraph 93 where a medical service is defined as a pharmacy) into the prescription entry web page (and



Art Unit: 3626

paragraph 94 where the prescription service is entered), and thereafter the computer transmits the prescription to the server (see paragraph 94).

Henley does not explicitly teach an electronic prescription handling system comprising:

- A portable storage medium configured to interface with the computer;
- An application residing on the portable storage medium, wherein the application is configured to execute once the portable storage medium interfaces with the computer, further wherein the application is configured to transmit a digital certificate to the server upon the application sensing a network connection to the server; and
- Means for authenticating the digital certificate on the server, wherein when the digital certificate is positively authenticated, the server transmits a prescription entry web page to the computer.

However, Chan teaches an electronic prescription handling system comprising:

- A portable storage medium configured to interface with the computer (see paragraph 83 where the portable medium is a CD-ROM);
- An application residing on the portable storage medium (see paragraph 83 where the software is stored on the CD-ROM), and
- Means for authenticating the digital certificate on the server (see paragraph 73), wherein when the digital certificate is positively authenticated (see paragraph 73), the server transmits a prescription entry web page to the computer (see paragraph 65 where the GUI is a web page and the level is restricted to the physician).

And Felsner teaches an electronic prescription handling system comprising:

Art Unit: 3626

- An application residing on the portable storage medium wherein the application is configured to execute once the portable storage medium interfaces with the computer, further wherein the application is configured to transmit a digital certificate (see paragraph 245 where the key is stored on the portable medium).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate these features into Henley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to incorporate these features into Henley to facilitate access to and utilization of the associated data stores and resources by the major participants in the health and wellness program (see Chan paragraph 9) and to provide a comprehensive set of technologies to address the full scope of issues presented in implementing a secure and versatile medical information infrastructure that respects the rights of patients (see Felsher paragraph 190).

25. As per claim 18, Henley in view of Chan and Felsher teach the system of claim 17 as described above.

Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the portable storage medium is one of (i) a CD-ROM, (ii) a DVD-ROM, and (iii) flash memory.

However, Chan teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the portable storage medium is one of (i) a CD-ROM, (ii) a DVD-ROM, and (iii) flash memory (see paragraph 83 where the portable storage medium is a CD-ROM).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and

Art Unit: 3626

Felsher to facilitate access to and utilization of the associated data stores and resources by the major participants in the health and wellness program (see Chan paragraph 9).

26. As per claim 19, Henley in view of Chan and Felsher teach the system of claim 17 as described above.

Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate identifies a physician.

However, Chan teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate identifies a physician (see paragraph 73 where the user is a physician).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher to facilitate access to and utilization of the associated data stores and resources by the major participants in the health and wellness program (see Chan paragraph 9).

27. As per claim 20, Henley in view of Chan and Felsher teach the system of claim 18 as described above.

Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate is hidden on the portable storage medium.

However, Felsher teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate is hidden on the portable storage medium (see paragraph 247 where the certificate is the hidden message).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher. One of ordinary

Art Unit: 3626

skill in the art would have motivated to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher to provide a comprehensive set of technologies to address the full scope of issues presented in implementing a secure and versatile medical information infrastructure that respects the rights of patients (see Felsher paragraph 190).

28. As per claim 21, Henley in view of Chan and Felsher teaches the system of claim 20 as described above.

Henley does not explicitly teach the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate cannot be copied from the portable storage medium.

However, Felsher teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the digital certificate cannot be copied from the portable storage medium (see paragraph 247).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher. One of ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to incorporate this feature into Henley in view of Chan and Felsher to provide a comprehensive set of technologies to address the full scope of issues presented in implementing a secure and versatile medical information infrastructure that respects the rights of patients (see Felsher paragraph 190).

29. As per claim 22, Henley in view of Chan and Felsher teaches the system of claim 19 as described above. Henley further teaches the electronic prescription handling system wherein the server transmits the prescription to a pharmacy (see paragraph 93 where plurality includes a first pharmacy computer).

*Response to Arguments*

30. Applicant's arguments, see 35 U.S.C. Section 101 Rejections, filed 5/16/2007, with respect to the rejections of claims 13 – 16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. Section 101 rejection of claims 13 – 16 has been withdrawn.

31. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 – 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

32. Applicant's arguments filed 5/16/2007 regarding the 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant argues that the Henley in view of Chan and Felsher does not show that the execution of the application on the portable storage medium upon interfacing of the portable storage medium with a computer that causes the claimed series of events to occur. The applicant's claim does not limit the possibility that the portable storage medium, the computer, and the network interface work interactively. The applicant does not claim that the application executes automatically or by some process that causes the application to execute once the medium is detected by the computer as shown within the specification but merely claims that the application is configured to execute once the portable storage medium interfaces with the computer. This is a potential execution that may occur from a variety of external causes including those as shown above. As an example of a program that is not configured to execute would be one where the program is compressed or a program that requires additional pieces that could be downloaded.
- The applicant further argues that the disclosed invention, but not claimed, is the issue. Had the applicant claimed that the computer system is configured to execute the program

Art Unit: 3626

rather than the application is configured to execute, the examiner would have agreed with the applicant. As disclosed in paragraph 26, but not claimed, it takes both the system and an application for execution.

***Conclusion***

33. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neal R. Sereboff whose telephone number is (571) 270-1373. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Thur from 7:30am to 5pm, with 1st Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NRS  
NRS

6/21/2007



C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600